arXiv:1401.0422v1 [math.CO] 2 Jan 2014

Three-arc graphs: characterization and domination

Guangjun Xu and Sanming Zhou

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
The University of Melbourne
Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia
E-mail: {gx, smzhou}@ms.unimelb.edu.au

January 3, 2014

Abstract

An arc of a graph is an oriented edge and a 3-arc is a 4-tuple (v, u, x, y) of vertices such that both (v, u, x) and (u, x, y) are paths of length two. The 3-arc graph of a graph G is defined to have vertices the arcs of G such that two arcs uv, xy are adjacent if and only if (v, u, x, y) is a 3-arc of G. In this paper we give a characterization of 3-arc graphs and obtain sharp upper bounds on the domination number of the 3-arc graph of a graph G in terms that of G.

Key words: 3-arc graph; domination number; graph operation
AMS subject classification (2000): 05C76, 05C69

1 Introduction

The 3-arc construction [10] is a relatively new graph operation that has been used in the classification or characterization of several families of arc-transitive graphs [5, 7, 10, 12, 21, 22]. (A graph is arc-transitive if its automorphism group acts transitively on the set of oriented edges.) As noted in [8], although this operation was first introduced in the context of graph symmetry, it is also of interest for general (not necessarily arc-transitive) graphs, and many problems on this new operation remain unexplored. In this paper we give partial solutions to two problems posed in [8] regarding 3-arc graphs.

An *arc* of a graph G is an ordered pair of adjacent vertices. For adjacent vertices u, v of G, we use uv to denote the arc from u to v, vu ($\neq uv$) the arc from v to u, and $\{u, v\}$ the edge between u and v. A 3-*arc* of G is a 4-tuple (v, u, x, y) of vertices, possibly with $v = y$, such that both (v, u, x) and (u, x, y) are paths of G. Let Δ be a set of 3-arcs of G. Suppose that Δ is *self-paired* in the sense that $(y, x, u, v) \in \Delta$ whenever $(v, u, x, y) \in \Delta$. Then the 3-*arc graph of G relative to* Δ, denoted by $X(G, \Delta)$, is defined [10] to be the (undirected) graph whose vertex set is the set of arcs of G such that two vertices corresponding to arcs uv and xy are adjacent if and only if $(v, u, x, y) \in \Delta$. In the context of graph symmetry, Δ is usually a self-paired orbit on the set of 3-arcs under the action of an automorphism group of G. In the case where Δ is the set of all 3-arcs of G, we call $X(G, \Delta)$ the 3-*arc graph* [9] of G and denote it by $X(G)$.

The first study of 3-arc graphs of general graphs was conducted by Knor and Zhou in [9]. Among other things they proved that if G has vertex-connectivity $\kappa(G) \geq 3$ then its 3-arc graph has vertex-connectivity $\kappa(X(G)) \geq (\kappa(G) - 1)^2$, and if G is connected of minimum

degree $\delta(G) \geq 3$ then the diameter $\mathrm{diam}(X(G))$ of $X(G)$ is equal to $\mathrm{diam}(G)$, $\mathrm{diam}(G)+1$ or $\mathrm{diam}(G)+2$. In [2], Balbuena, García-Vázquez and Montejano improved the bound on the vertex-connectivity by proving $\kappa(X(G)) \geq \min\{\kappa(G)(\delta(G)-1), (\delta(G)-1)^2\}$ for any connected graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 3$. They also proved [2] that for such a graph the edge-connectivity of $X(G)$ satisfies $\lambda(X(G)) \geq (\delta(G)-1)^2$, and they further gave a lower bound on the restricted edge-connectivity of $X(G)$ in the case when G is 2-connected. In [8], Knor, Xu and Zhou studied the independence, domination and chromatic numbers of 3-arc graphs.

In a recent paper [20] we obtained a necessary and sufficient condition [20, Theorem 1] for $X(G)$ to be Hamiltonian. In particular, we proved [20, Theorem 2] that a 3-arc graph is Hamiltonian if and only if it is connected, and that if G is connected with $\delta(G) \geq 3$ then all its iterative 3-arc graphs $X^i(G)$ are Hamiltonian, $i \geq 1$. (The iterative 3-arc graphs are recursively defined by $X^1(G) := X(G)$ and $X^{i+1}(G) := X(X^i(G))$ for $i \geq 1$.) As a consequence we obtained [20, Corollary 2] that if a vertex-transitive graph is isomorphic to the 3-arc graph of a connected arc-transitive graph of degree at least three, then it is Hamiltonian. This provides new support to the well-known Lovász-Thomassen conjecture [17] which asserts that all connected vertex-transitive graphs, with finitely many exceptions, are Hamiltonian. We also proved (as a consequence of a more general result) [20, Theorem 4] that if a graph G with at least four vertices is Hamilton-connected, then so are its iterative 3-arc graphs $X^i(G)$, $i \geq 1$.

The 3-arc construction was generalized to directed graphs in [8]. Given a directed graph D, the 3-*arc graph* [8] of D, denoted by $X(D)$, is defined to be the undirected graph whose vertex set is the set of arcs of D such that two vertices corresponding to arcs uv, xy of D are adjacent if and only if $v \neq x$, $y \neq u$ and u, x are adjacent in D. Recently, we proved with Wood [19] that the well-known Hadwiger's graph colouring conjecture [18] is true for the 3-arc graph of any directed graph with no loops.

In spite of the results above, compared with the well-known line graph operation [6] and the 2-path graph operation [1, 11], our knowledge of 3-arc graphs is quite limited and many problems on them are yet to be explored. For instance, the following problems were posed in [8]:

Problem 1 *Characterize 3-arc graphs of connected graphs.*

Problem 2 *Give a sharp upper bound on $\gamma(X(G))$ in terms of $\gamma(G)$ for any connected graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, where γ denotes the domination number.*

In this paper we give partial solutions to these problems. We first show that there is no forbidden subgraph characterization of 3-arc graphs (Proposition 1), and then we provide a descriptive characterization of 3-arc graphs (Theorem 2). We give a sharp upper bound for $\gamma(X(G))$ in terms of $\gamma(G)$ (Theorem 5) for any graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, and more upper bounds for $\gamma(X(G))$ in terms of $\gamma(G)$ and the maximum degree $\Delta(G)$ when $2 \leq \delta(G) \leq 4$ (Theorem 6). Finally, we prove that if G is claw-free with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then $\gamma(X(G)) \leq 4\gamma(G)$ and moreover this bound is sharp (Theorem 7).

All graphs in the paper are finite and undirected with no loops or multiple edges. The *order* of a graph is the number of vertices in the graph. As usual, the minimum and maximum degrees of a graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ are denoted by $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$, respectively. The degree

of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ in G is denoted by $\deg(v)$. The *neighbourhood* of v in G, denoted by $N(v)$, is the set of vertices of G adjacent to v, and the *closed neighbourhood* of v is defined as $N[v] := N(v) \cup \{v\}$. We say that v *dominates* every vertex in $N(v)$, or every vertex in $N(v)$ is *dominated* by v. For a subset S of $V(G)$, denote $N(S) := \cup_{v \in S} N(v)$ and $N[S] := N(S) \cup S$. We may add subscript G to these notations (e.g. $\deg_G(v)$) to indicate the underlying graph when there is a risk of confusion. If $N[S] = V(G)$, then S is called a *dominating set* of G. The *domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G; a dominating set of G with cardinality $\gamma(G)$ is called a $\gamma(G)$*-set* of G. The subgraph of G induced by S is denoted by $G[S]$, and the subgraph of G induced by $V(G) - S$ is denoted by $G - S$.

The reader is referred to [18] for undefined notation and terminology.

2 A characterization of 3-arc graphs

It is well known that line graphs can be characterized by a finite set of forbidden induced subgraphs [6]. In contrast, a similar characterization does not exist for 3-arcs graphs, as we show in the following result.

Proposition 1 *There is no characterization of* 3*-arc graphs by a finite set of forbidden induced subgraphs. More specifically, any graph is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of some* 3*-arc graph.*

Proof Let H be any graph. Define H^* to be the graph obtained from H by adding a new vertex x and an edge joining x and each vertex of H. It is not hard see that $u, v \in V(H)$ are adjacent in H if and only if the arcs ux, vx of H^* are adjacent in $X(H^*)$. Thus the subgraph of $X(H^*)$ induced by $A := \{vx : v \in V(H)\} \subseteq V(X(H^*))$ is isomorphic to H via the bijection $v \leftrightarrow vx$ between $V(H)$ and A. Since H is arbitrary, this means that any graph is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of some 3-arc graph, and so the result follows. □

Next we give a descriptive characterization of 3-arc graphs. To avoid triviality we assume that the graph under consideration has at least one edge.

Theorem 2 *A graph G having at least one edge is isomorphic to the* 3*-arc graph of some graph if and only if $V(G)$ admits a partition $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ and $E(G)$ admits a partition $\mathcal{E}$ such that the following hold:*

(a) *each element of $\mathcal{V}_1$ contains exactly one vertex of G, and each element of $\mathcal{V}_2$ is an independent set of G with at least two vertices;*

(b) *each $E_i \in \mathcal{E}$ induces a complete bipartite subgraph B_i of G with each part of the bipartition a subset of some $V \in \mathcal{V}_2$ with size $|V| - 1$;*

(c) *if $v \in V \in \mathcal{V}_2$, then v belongs to at most $|V| - 1$ complete bipartite graphs described in (b);*

(d) *if two distinct complete bipartite graphs B_i and B_j in (b) have parts contained in the same $V \in \mathcal{V}_2$, then B_i and B_j have exactly $|V| - 2$ common vertices, and all of them are in V;*

(e) $2|\mathcal{E}| = \sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}_2} |V| - |\mathcal{V}_1|$.

Proof For a graph H and a vertex v of H, denote by $A_H(v)$ the set of arcs of H with tail v.

Necessity: Suppose that G is isomorphic to $X(H)$ for some graph H. We identify G with $X(H)$. Let $\mathcal{V}_1 := \{A_H(v) : \deg_H(v) = 1\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_2 := \{A_H(v) : \deg_H(v) \geq 2\}$. Then each element of $\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ is an independent set of G, and each edge of G occurs only between distinct elements $A_H(u)$, $A_H(v)$ of $\mathcal{V}_2$ with u, v adjacent in H. For each pair of adjacent vertices u, v of H with $\deg_H(u) \geq 2$ and $\deg_H(v) \geq 2$, the set $E_{\{u,v\}}$ of edges of G between $A_H(u)$ and $A_H(v)$ induces a complete bipartite subgraph of G. Denote by $\mathcal{E}$ the family of such $E_{\{u,v\}}$. It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ is a partition of $V(G)$ and $\mathcal{E}$ is a partition of $E(G)$ such that (a)-(e) are satisfied.

Sufficiency: Suppose that $V(G)$ admits a partition $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ and $E(G)$ admits a partition $\mathcal{E}$ satisfying (a)-(e). We construct a graph H such that $X(H)$ is isomorphic to G.

We construct for each $V_x \in \mathcal{V}$ a vertex x of H. We say that x represents V_x, and that x is of type $\mathcal{V}_1$ or $\mathcal{V}_2$ according to whether V_x belongs to $\mathcal{V}_1$ or $\mathcal{V}_2$. For each bipartite graph B_i as in (b), there are distinct elements $V_x, V_y \in \mathcal{V}_2$ and vertices $v_{i,x} \in V_x, v_{i,y} \in V_y$ such that $\{V_x - \{v_{i,x}\}, V_y - \{v_{i,y}\}\}$ is the bipartition of B_i. The pair $\{x, y\}$ is determined uniquely by B_i, and vice versa (so we may write $i = i(x, y)$), and we add the edge $\{x, y\}$ to H. For each $V_x \in \mathcal{V}_2$, denote by b_x the number of complete bipartite graphs B_i as in (b) that contain at least one vertex of V_x. By (b), one part of the bipartition of each of such graphs B_i must be a subset of V_x with size $|V_x| - 1$. On the other hand, by (c) each $v \in V_x$ belongs to at most $|V_x| - 1$ such complete bipartite graphs B_i. By counting the number of ordered pairs (v, B_i) with $v \in V_x \cap V(B_i)$, we obtain $b_x(|V_x| - 1) \leq |V_x|(|V_x| - 1)$, yielding $b_x \leq |V_x|$. We then add $|V_x| - b_x$ edges to H joining x to $|V_x| - b_x$ vertices of type $\mathcal{V}_1$, in such a way that no vertex of type $\mathcal{V}_1$ is repeatedly used. Thus each vertex x of H of type $\mathcal{V}_2$ has degree $|V_x|$ in H. Note that the sum $\cup_{V_x\in\mathcal{V}_2}|V_x|$ counts each edge between two vertices of type $\mathcal{V}_2$ twice, and each edge with one end-vertex of type $\mathcal{V}_1$ once. The total number of vertices of type $\mathcal{V}_1$ required is $\cup_{V_x\in\mathcal{V}_2}|V_x| - 2|\mathcal{E}|$, which agrees with $|\mathcal{V}_1|$ by (e). This completes the construction of H.

We now prove that $X(H)$ is isomorphic to G. By the construction above, each vertex x of H has degree $|V_x|$ in H, and the set $A_H(x)$ of arcs of H outgoing from x is an independent set of $X(H)$ with size $|V_x|$. Obviously, such independent sets $A_H(x)$ of $X(H)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the elements V_x of $\mathcal{V}$. Note that $\{A_H(x) : x \in V(H)\}$ is a partition of the vertex set $A(H)$ of $X(H)$ which corresponds to the partition $\mathcal{V} = \{V_x : x \in V(H)\}$ of the vertex set of G.

Let $\{x, y\}$ be an edge of H with $\deg_H(x) \geq 2$ and $\deg_H(y) \geq 2$. Then $A_H(x) \cup A_H(y)$ induces a complete bipartite subgraph $B(x, y)$ of $X(H)$ with bipartition $\{A_H(x) - \{xy\}, A_H(y) - \{yx\}\}$. On the other hand, by the definition of H, the edges of G between $V_x - \{v_{i,x}\}$ and $V_y - \{v_{i,y}\}$ induce a complete bipartite subgraph of G that is equal to B_i as in (b) with $i = i(x, y)$. It can be verified that $\{x, y\} \mapsto B_{i(x,y)}$ defines a bijection from the set of edges $\{x, y\}$ of H with $\deg_H(x) \geq 2$ and $\deg_H(y) \geq 2$ to the set of complete bipartite graphs as in (b).

For a fixed $V_x \in \mathcal{V}_2$, the corresponding vertex x has degree at least 2 in H. For each neighbour y of x in H with $V_y \in \mathcal{V}_2$, the complete bipartite graph B_i with $i = i(x, y)$ has

bipartition $\{V_x - \{v_{i,x}\}, V_y - \{v_{i,y}\}\}$. By the construction of H, one can verify that the mapping $xy \mapsto v_{i,x}$ (where $i = i(x,y)$) is a bijection from $\{xy : y \in N_H(x), \deg_H(y) \geq 2\}$ (which is a subset of $A_H(x)$) to V_x. Let $L := \{y \in N_H(x) : \deg_H(y) = 1\}$ be the set of leaf-neighbours of x, and W_x be the set of vertices $w \in V_x$ such that there exists no B_i as in (b) with $V(B_i) \cap V_x = V_x - \{w\}$. Then $|L| = |W_x|$ and so we can choose a bijection (in an arbitrary manner) between L and W_x. Finally, we choose an arbitrary bijection between the set of arcs of H starting from leaves and $\mathcal{V}_1$. Then we have defined a bijection between the vertices of $X(H)$ and the vertices of G. From the way this bijection is defined it is straightforward to verify that it is an isomorphism between $X(H)$ and G. □

3 Domination number of 3-arc graphs

Given a graph G, denote by $G \circ K_1$ the graph obtained from G by adding for each $x \in V(G)$ a new vertex x' and a new edge joining x and x'. Define $\mathcal{A}$ to be the family of graphs depicted in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Graphs in family $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 3 *Let G be a connected graph of order n.*

(a) *If $\delta(G) \geq 1$, then $\gamma(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$ ([14, p.206]), and $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ if and only if $G \cong C_4$ or $H \circ K_1$ for some graph H ([4, 15]);*

(b) *if $\delta(G) \geq 2$ and $G \notin \mathcal{A}$, then $\gamma(G) \leq \frac{2n}{5}$ ([13]);*

(c) *if $\delta(G) \geq 3$, then $\gamma(G) \leq \frac{3n}{8}$ ([16]).*

Given a graph G, define

$$V_i(G) := \{x \in V(G) : \deg(x) \geq i\}, \ i \geq 0. \tag{1}$$

For a fixed subset U of $V(G)$, a subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is called a $(G:U)$-*dominating set* if $U \subseteq N[D]$. The $(G:U)$-*domination number*, denoted by $\gamma(G:U)$, is the minimum cardinality of a $(G:U)$-dominating set. Note that a $(G:U)$-dominating set needs not be a subset of U, and a $(G:V(G))$-dominating set is precisely an ordinary dominating set of G.

Lemma 4 *Let G be a graph with order n. Then*

(a) $\gamma(G : V_1(G)) \le \dfrac{n}{2}$, *and equality holds if and only if each component of* G *is isomorphic to* C_4 *or* $H \circ K_1$ *for some connected graph* H *(which relies on the component);*

(b) $\gamma(G : V_2(G)) \le \dfrac{2n}{5}$ *if each component of* G *is not isomorphic to a graph in the family* $\mathcal{A}$*;*

(c) $\gamma(G : V_3(G)) \le \dfrac{3(n+2)}{8}$.

Proof Let G' be the graph obtained from G by deleting all isolated vertices. Then $|V(G')| \le n$ and $\gamma(G : V_i(G)) \le \gamma(G')$ for each $i \ge 1$.

(a) By Lemma 3(a), $\gamma(G : V_1(G)) \le \gamma(G') \le |V(G')|/2 \le n/2$. Thus $\gamma(G : V_1(G)) = n/2$ if and only if all equalities throughout this inequality chain hold. The first equality in the chain holds if and only if G contains no isolated vertex, and the second equality holds if and only if (see Lemma 3(a)) each component of G' is isomorphic to C_4 or $H \circ K_1$ for some connected graph H. Hence the result in (a) follows.

(b) Denote $G_2 := G[V_2(G)]$ and $W := N(V_2(G)) - V_2(G)$. Then W contains all vertices of G outside $V_2(G)$ that have exactly one neighbour in $V_2(G)$. Thus $G[W]$ consists of isolated vertices, say, $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l$, where $l \ge 0$. Denote by x_i' the unique neighbour of $x_i \in W$ in $V_2(G)$. Note that it may happen that $x_i' = x_j'$ for distinct $x_i, x_j \in W$.

Let $G_2 := G[V_2(G) \cup W]$. Then each vertex in $V_2(G)$ has degree at least 2 in G_2. Define a new graph J as follows. If $l = 0$, set $J := G_2$; if $l \ge 2$, let J be the graph obtained from G_2 by adding all possible edges to $G[W]$ until it becomes a path of length $l-1$; if $l = 1$, let J be the graph obtained from G_2 by joining x_1 to a neighbour of x_1' other than x_1 in G_2 (such a neighbour exists because $\deg_{G_2}(x_1') \ge 2$).

It is easy to see that J has minimum degree 2. Let $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_s$ be the components of J. Let r_j be the order of R_j, and let $T_j := V_2(R_j) \cap V_2(G)$, for $1 \le j \le s$. Then $\gamma(R_j : T_j) \le \gamma(R_j : V_2(R_j)) = \gamma(R_j)$. We claim that $\gamma(R_j : T_j) \le 2r_j/5$. In fact, if $R_j \notin \mathcal{A}$, then by Lemma 3(b) we have $\gamma(R_j : T_j) \le \gamma(R_j) \le 2r_j/5$. Suppose that $R_j \in \mathcal{A}$. Since no component of G is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{A}$, by examining each graph in $\mathcal{A}$, we see that at least one edge joining two degree-two vertices in R_j is not in G (such an edge was introduced in the construction of J). Thus at least one vertex of R_j is not in T_j. It is readily seen that $\gamma(R_j : T_j) \le 1 < 8/5 = 2r_j/5$ if $R_j \cong C_4 \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\gamma(R_j : T_j) \le 2 < 14/5 = 2r_j/5$ otherwise. Since the union of all $\gamma(R_j : T_j)$-sets is a $(G_2 : V_2(G))$-dominating set, it follows that $\gamma(G : V_2(G)) \le 2|V(G_2)|/5 \le 2n/5$.

(c) Denote $G_3 := G[V_3(G)]$ and $W := N(V_3(G)) - V_3(G)$. Since each vertex of W has at least one neighbour in $V_3(G)$, if a vertex of W has degree two in $G[W]$, then it must be in $V_3(G)$ and so cannot be in W, a contradiction. Therefore, $\Delta(G[W]) = 1$ and $G[W]$ consists of isolated vertices and independent edges. Denote $W = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l\}$, where $l \ge 0$, and for each i choose x_i' to be any (but fixed) neighbour of x_i in $V_3(G)$.

Let $G_3 := G[V_3(G) \cup W]$. Define a new graph J as follows: If $l = 0$, set $J := G_3$; if $l \ge 3$, let J be the graph obtained from G_3 by adding all possible edges to $G[W]$ until it becomes a cycle of length l; if $l = 1$, let J be the graph obtained from G_3 by adding two new vertices u_1, u_2 together with edges $\{u_1, u_2\}$, $\{x_1, u_1\}$, $\{x_1, u_2\}$, $\{u_1, x_1'\}$ and $\{u_2, x_1'\}$; if $l = 2$, let J be the graph obtained from G_3 by adding two new vertices u_1, u_2 together with all possible edges among u_1, u_2, x_1 and x_2.

Note that $\delta(J) = 3$. By Lemma 3(c), we have $\gamma(J) \leq 3|V(J)|/8$. Let D be a $\gamma(J)$-set. If $D \cap \{u_1, u_2\} = \emptyset$, then D is a dominating set of G_3 and so $\gamma(G_3) \leq \gamma(J)$. If $D \cap \{u_1, u_2\} \neq \emptyset$, then by the minimality of D we have $D \cap \{x_1, x_2\} = \emptyset$ and D contains exactly one of u_1 and u_2. Thus $(D - \{u_1, u_2\}) \cup \{x_1\}$ is a dominating set of G_3, and again we have $\gamma(G_3) \leq \gamma(J)$. Since any dominating set of G_3 is also a $(G_3 : V_3(G))$-dominating set, we obtain that $\gamma(G : V_3(G)) \leq \gamma(G_3) \leq 3|V(J)|/8 \leq 3(|V(G_3)| + 2)/8 \leq 3(n + 2)/8$. □

Theorem 5 *Let G be a graph with minimum degree $\delta := \delta(G) \geq 2$. Then*

$$\gamma(X(G)) \leq 3\gamma(G) + \min_{S \in \mathcal{Q}} \{\gamma(G_S : V_{\delta-1}(G_S))\} - 1, \tag{2}$$

where $G_S = G - S$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is the set of $\gamma(G)$-sets of G. Moreover, this bound is attainable.

Proof Let S be a $\gamma(G)$-set of G and denote $H := G_S$ for simplicity. As in (1), let $V_j(H)$ denote the set of vertices of $V(H)$ that have degree at least j in H. With each $x \in S$ we associate a set

$$A(x) := \{xx_1, xx_2, x_2x_3\} \tag{3}$$

of three arcs of G, where x_1, x_2 are distinct neighbours of x, and x_3 is a neighbour of x_2 other than x. Since $\delta \geq 2$, such a set $A(x)$ exists for every $x \in S$. (In general, many sets $A(x)$ may be obtained this way. We choose one of them arbitrarily and fix it.) Define

$$A(S) := \cup_{x \in S} A(x) \tag{4}$$

so that $|A(S)| = 3|S| = 3\gamma(G)$. Set

$$W := \{w \in V(G) - S : |N(w) \cap S| = 1\} \tag{5}$$

$$U := V(G) - (S \cup W).$$

Then S, W and U form a partition of $V(G)$. Since each $w \in W$ has exactly one neighbour in S, it has at least $\delta - 1$ neighbours in H. Therefore,

$$W \subseteq V_{\delta-1}(H). \tag{6}$$

Thus every $(H : V_{\delta-1}(H))$-dominating set is also an $(H : W)$-dominating set, and therefore

$$\gamma(H : W) \leq \gamma(H : V_{\delta-1}(H)). \tag{7}$$

Let D be a minimum $(H : W)$-dominating set in H. With each vertex $y \in D$ we choose an arc yy' such that $y' \in N(y) \cap S$. Such a vertex y' exists for every $y \in D$ because y is dominated by a vertex in S. Define

$$A(D) := \{yy' : y \in D\}. \tag{8}$$

Then $|A(D)| = |D| = \gamma(H : W)$, and so $|A(D)| \leq \gamma(H : V_{\delta-1}(H))$ by (7).

Claim 1: $A(S) \cup A(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$. Hence

$$\gamma(X(G)) \leq |A(S) \cup A(D)| \leq |A(S)| + |A(D)| \leq 3\gamma(G) + \gamma(H : V_{\delta-1}(H)). \tag{9}$$

Proof of Claim 1: It suffices to show that each arc with tail in S, W or U is dominated in $X(G)$ by at least one element of $A(S) \cup A(D)$. Let ab be an arc of G. When $a \in S$, if $b = a_1$ or a_2 (where a_1 and a_2 are the vertices in the definition of $A(a)$), then clearly $ab \in A(S)$; if b is a neighbour of a other than a_1 and a_2, then ab is dominated by $a_2a_2' \in A(S)$. If $a \in U$, then a has at least two neighbours in S and so at least one of them, say, $z \in S$ is different from b. Thus ab is dominated by $zv \in A(S)$, where $v \in \{z_1, z_2\} - \{a\}$ with z_1, z_2 the neighbours of z used in the definition of $A(z)$. Suppose that $a \in W$ and let z be the unique neighbour of a in S. If $b \notin S$, then ab is dominated by $zv \in A(S)$, where $v \in \{z_1, z_2\} - \{a\}$. So we assume $b \in S$, so that $b = z$. If $a \in D$, then $ab \in A(D)$ by the definition of $A(D)$. If $a \notin D$, then a is dominated by some vertex $y \in D$ as D dominates all vertices of W in H including a. Hence ab is dominated by $yy' \in A(D)$ in $X(G)$. This completes the proof of Claim 1.

In what follows we will show that the upper bound in (9) can be decreased by one. In fact, in the case when $A(S) \cap A(D) \neq \emptyset$, we have $|A(S) \cup A(D)| \leq |A(S)| + |A(D)| - 1$ and similar to (9) we obtain $\gamma(X(G)) \leq 3\gamma(G) + \gamma(H : V_{\delta-1}(H)) - 1$. We now prove that the same bound holds when $A(S) \cap A(D) = \emptyset$. This is achieved by proving:

Claim 2: If $A(S) \cap A(D) = \emptyset$, then we can modify $A(S) \cup A(D)$ to obtain a new dominating set $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$ of $X(G)$ with size at most $|A(S) \cup A(D)| - 1$.

Proof of Claim 2: We first deal with the case where $|S| = 1$ (that is, $\gamma(G) = 1$). In this case, $D \neq \emptyset$ and $W = V(G) - S$ (and so $U = \emptyset$). Denote $S = \{x\}$ and let $y \in D$. Since $\delta \geq 2$, we may choose a neighbour $z \neq x$ of y. Let $A_1(S) := \{xz, zy, yx\}$. Note that $A(D)$ contains an arc yy' with $y' \in N(y) \cap S$. If $yy' \neq yx$, then let $A_1(D)$ be obtained from $A(D)$ by replacing this particular arc yy' by yx but retaining all other $uu' \in A(D)$ in (8); otherwise, let $A_1(D) := A(D)$. Since yx appears in both $A_1(S)$ and $A_1(D)$, we have $|A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)| = |A(S) \cup A(D)| - 1$. We claim that each arc of G is dominated by $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$. In fact, let ab be an arbitrary arc of G. Since $W = V(G) - S$, either $a \in S$ or $a \in W$. If $a = x \in S$, then ab is dominated by zy or $ab = xz$. Suppose that $a \in W$. If $b = x \in S$, then $ab \in A_1(D)$ or ab is dominated by an arc in $A_1(D)$. If $b \notin S$, then $ab = zy$ or ab is dominated by either xz or yx. Therefore, $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$.

In the rest proof of Claim 2, we assume that $|S| \geq 2$.

Case 1: S is not an independent set of G. That is, there is an edge joining two vertices, say x and y, of S. Let $x' \neq y$ be a neighbour of x and $y' \neq x$ be a neighbour of y. Let $A_1(S)$ be obtained from $A(S)$ by replacing $A(x)$ by $\{xx', xy, yy'\}$, $A(y)$ by $\{yy', yx, xx'\}$, but leaving other $A(u)$ for $u \in S - \{x, y\}$ unchanged, in (4). Since $\{xx', xy, yy'\}$ and $\{yy', yx, xx'\}$ have two common arcs, we have $|A_1(S)| = |A(S)| - 2$. Set $A_1(D) := A(D)$. Then $|A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)| = |A(S) \cup A(D)| - 2$ and one can show that $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$.

Case 2: S is an independent set of G and $U \neq \emptyset$. Let $z \in U$ and let $x, y \in S$ be distinct neighbours of z. If $\deg(z) \geq 3$, let z' be a neighbour of z other than x and y. Since $\delta \geq 2$, we may choose a neighbour $x' \neq z$ of x and a neighbour $y' \neq z$ of y. Let $A_1(S)$ be obtained from $A(S)$ by replacing $A(x)$ by $\{xx', xz, zz'\}$, $A(y)$ by $\{yy', yz, zz'\}$, but leaving other $A(u)$ with $u \in S - \{x, y\}$ unchanged, in (4). Since $\{xx', xz, zz'\}$ and $\{yy', yz, zz'\}$ have one arc in common, we have $|A_1(S)| = |A(S)| - 1$. If $\deg(z) = 2$, then let $A_1(S)$ be obtained from $A(S)$

by replacing $A(x)$ by $\{xz, zy\}$, $A(y)$ by $\{yz, zx\}$, but leaving other $A(u)$ with $u \in S - \{x, y\}$ unchanged, in (4). Then $|A_1(S)| = |A(S)| - 2$. Set $A_1(D) := A(D)$ regardless of the degree of z. Then $|A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)| \leq |A(S) \cup A(D)| - 1$ and $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$.

Case 3: S is an independent set of G and $U = \emptyset$. Then $W = V(G) - S \neq \emptyset$, $|A(D)| \geq 1$ and $|W - D| \geq 1$. Choose a vertex $z \in W - D$. Since S is a dominating set of G, we may choose a neighbour $x \in S$ of z. Similarly, we may choose a neighbour $v \in D$ of z in H and a neighbour $u \in S$ of v in G. It may happen that $u = x$, but this will not affect our subsequent proof.

Let $A_1(S)$ be obtained from $A(S)$ by replacing $A(x)$ by $\{xz, zv, vu\}$, but leaving other $A(y)$ with $y \in S - \{x\}$ unchanged, in (4). Since $v \in D$, $A(D)$ contains an arc vv' with $v' \in N(v) \cap S$. If $vv' \neq vu$, then let $A_1(D)$ be obtained from $A(D)$ by replacing this particular arc vv' by vu but retaining all other $yy' \in A(D)$ in (8); otherwise, let $A_1(D) := A(D)$. Since vu appears in both $A_1(D)$ and $A_1(S)$, we have $|A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)| = |A(S) \cup A(D)| - 1$. We now show that $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$. In fact, by the definition of $A_1(D)$ and $A_1(S)$ one can see that every arc with tail not in $N[x]$ that is dominated by $A(S) \cup A(D)$ is now dominated by $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$. Let ab be an arc with $a \in N[x]$. If $a = x$, then $ab = xz \in A_1(S)$ or ab is dominated by $zv \in A_1(S)$. Suppose that $a \in N(x)$. If $a = z$, then $ab = zv$ or ab is dominated by $vu \in A_1(S)$. Suppose that $a \in N(x) - \{z\}$. If $b \neq x$, then ab is dominated by $xz \in A_1(S)$. If $b = x$, then either $ab \in A_1(D)$ when $a \in D$, or ab is dominated by $yy' \in A_1(D)$, where y is a vertex in D that dominates a in H. Therefore, $A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$.

So far we have completed the proof of Claim 2. By this claim (and the discussion before it) and (9), we obtain $\gamma(X(G)) \leq |A_1(S) \cup A_1(D)| \leq |A(S) \cup A(D)| - 1 \leq 3\gamma(G) + \gamma(H : V_{\delta-1}(H)) - 1$. Since this holds for any $\gamma(G)$-set S of G and since $H = G_S$, we obtain (2) immediately.

It is easy to see that the bound in (2) is achieved by the 3-cycle C_3 and in general by any friendship graph (that is, a graph obtained from a number of copies of C_3 by identifying one vertex from each copy to form a single vertex). □

It was proved in [8] that, for any connected graph G of order $n \geq 4$ and minimum degree at least 2, we have $\gamma(X(G)) \leq n$. Combining this with $n/(1 + \Delta(G)) \leq \gamma(G)$ [3], we then have

$$\gamma(X(G)) \leq (1 + \Delta(G))\gamma(G). \tag{10}$$

The following theorem improves this bound for any graph G with $\Delta(G) \geq \delta(G) = 2, 3$ or 4. In Theorem 7 we will give a further improved bound for any claw-free graph with minimum degree at least two.

Theorem 6 *Let G be a graph.*

(a) *If $\delta(G) = 2$, then* $\gamma(X(G)) \leq \left(\frac{\Delta(G)}{2} + 3\right)\gamma(G) - 1$;

(b) *if $\delta(G) = 3$, then* $\gamma(X(G)) \leq \left(\frac{2\Delta(G)}{5} + 3\right)\gamma(G) - 1$;

(c) *if $\delta(G) = 4$, then* $\gamma(X(G)) \leq \left(\frac{3(\Delta(G) + 2)}{8} + 3\right)\gamma(G) - 1$.

Moreover, the bounds in (a) and (b) are attainable.

Proof Denote $\delta := \delta(G)$. As in the proof of Theorem 5, let S be a $\gamma(G)$-set of G and denote $H := G - S$. Let H' be obtained from H by deleting all isolated vertices. Then $\gamma(H : V_1(H)) \leq \gamma(H')$.

(a) If $\delta = 2$, then by Theorems 5, Lemma 4(a) and the fact that $|V(G)| \leq (\Delta(G)+1)\gamma(G)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(X(G)) &\leq 3\gamma(G) + \gamma(H : V_1(H)) - 1 \\
&\leq 3\gamma(G) + \frac{n - \gamma(G)}{2} - 1 \\
&\leq 3\gamma(G) + \frac{(\Delta(G)+1)\gamma(G) - \gamma(G)}{2} - 1 \\
&= \left(\frac{\Delta(G)}{2} + 3\right)\gamma(G) - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Assume $\delta = 3$. Let $A(S)$ and W be defined by (4) and (5), respectively, with $A(x)$ as given in (3) for each $x \in S$. By (6), we have $W \subseteq V_2(H)$.

Let $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_s$ be the set of components of H', and let r_j be the order of R_j. We are going to prove that we can choose an appropriate subset D_j of $V(R_j)$ for each j such that $|D_j| \leq 2r_j/5$ and $A(S) \cup A(\cup_{j=1}^{s} D_j)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$.

In fact, if R_j is not isomorphic to any graph in the family $\mathcal{A}$ (see Figure 1), then we choose D_j to be a minimum $(R_j : V_2(R_j))$-dominating set. By Lemma 4(b), we have $|D_j| = \gamma(R_j : V_2(R_j)) \leq 2r_j/5$.

Suppose that a component R_j is isomorphic to some graph in $\mathcal{A}$. If R_j contains a vertex z which is not in W, then we choose D_j to be a minimum dominating set of $R_j - \{z\}$. Since in this case D_j is also an $(R_j : W \cap V(R_j))$-dominating set, we have $\gamma(R_j : W \cap V(R_j)) \leq \gamma(R_j - \{z\}) = |D_j| < 2r_j/5$ by noting that $r_j = 4$ or 7.

Now assume that all vertices of R_j are in W. Let z be an arbitrary vertex of R_j and D_j a minimum dominating set of $R_j - \{z\}$. Let $A(D_j)$ be the set of arcs xx' of G such that $x \in D_j$ and x' is the unique neighbour of x in S. It is not hard to verify that $|D_j| < 2r_j/5$. Let u be a neighbour of z in R_j. Since $\delta(R_j) = 2$ (see Figure 1), we can choose a neighbour y of u in G other than u' and z (so that y is in R_j), where u' is the unique neighbour of u in S. In forming $A(S)$ by (4), we choose $A(u)$ to be $\{u'u, uy, u'v\}$, where v is a neighbour of u' other than u. Similar to what we did in the proof of Theorem 5, when necessary we may modify $A(S)$ to obtain a new set $A(S)$ (also denoted by $A(S)$) such that every arc of G with tail z is dominated in $X(G)$ by either uy or an arc in $A(z')$, where z' is the unique neighbour of z in S. It can be verified that we can always choose an appropriate pair of vertices z, u such that this happens. In this way we ensure that all arcs emanating from vertices of R_j are dominated by $A(S) \cup A(D_j)$ in $X(G)$.

With D_j as above we now set $D := \cup_{j=1}^{s} D_j$. As in (8), choose a set of arcs of G by setting $A(D_j) = \{xx' : x \in D_j\}$, where x' is a neighbour of x in S. (As seen in the previous paragraph, such a set $A(D_j)$ is unique when R_j is isomorphic to some graph in $\mathcal{A}$ and $V(R_j) \subseteq W$.) Set $A(D) = \cup_{j=1}^{s} A(D_j)$. Since $|D_j| \leq 2r_j/5$ for each j, we have $|A(D)| = |D| = \Sigma_{j=1}^{s} |D_j| \leq$

$2|V(H')|/5 \le 2|V(G)-S|/5$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 5, once can verify that $A(S)\cup A(D)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(X(G)) &\le |A(S)| + |A(D)| - 1\\ &\le 3\gamma(G) + \frac{2|V(G)-S|}{5} - 1\\ &\le 3\gamma(G) + \frac{2((\Delta(G)+1)\gamma(G) - \gamma(G))}{5} - 1\\ &= \left(\frac{2\Delta(G)}{5} + 3\right)\gamma(G) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

(c) If $\delta = 4$, then by Theorem 5 and Lemma 4(c),

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(X(G)) &\le 3\gamma(G) + \gamma(H : V_3(H)) - 1\\ &\le 3\gamma(G) + \frac{3(n-\gamma(G)+2)}{8} - 1\\ &\le 3\gamma(G) + \frac{3((\Delta(G)+1)\gamma(G) - \gamma(G)+2)}{8} - 1\\ &= \left(\frac{3(\Delta(G)+2)}{8} + 3\right)\gamma(G) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

The bounds in (a) and (b) are attained by the complete graphs K_3 and K_4 respectively. This completes the proof. □

A graph is *claw-free* if it does not contain the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,3}$ as an induced subgraph. The following result significantly improves the upper bounds in Theorem 6 for claw-free graphs, and it does not require the minimum degree to be 2, 3 or 4.

Theorem 7 *Let G be a claw-free graph with $\delta(G) \ge 2$. Then*

$$\gamma(X(G)) \le 4\gamma(G) \tag{11}$$

and this bound is attainable.

Proof Let S be a $\gamma(G)$-set of G. We prove (11) by constructing a dominating set of $X(G)$ with size at most $4\gamma(G)$.

Since G is claw-free, for each $x \in V(G)$, the induced subgraph $G[N(x)]$ has independence number, and hence domination number, at most 2. Thus, for each $x \in S$, we can choose a dominating set of $G[N(x)]$ with size 2, say, $D_x := \{x_1, x_2\}$, where $x_1, x_2 \in N(x)$. We then associate x with a set $A(x)$ of four arcs of G in the following way. If $\deg(x) = 2$, then let $A(x) = \{xx_1, xx_2, x_1x, x_2x\}$. If $\deg(x) \ge 3$, then let $x_3 \in N(x) - D_x$. Since D_x is a dominating set of $G[N(x)]$, x_3 is adjacent to at least one of x_1 and x_2. We may assume without loss of generality that x_3 is adjacent to x_1, and then we set $A(x) = \{xx_1, x_1x_3, x_3x, x_2x\}$. Define

$$A(S) := \cup_{x\in S} A(x).$$

We now show that $A(S)$ is a dominating set of $X(G)$. To this end it suffices to show that any arc ab of G outside $A(S)$ is dominated in $X(G)$ by at least one arc in $A(S)$. In fact, if $a \in S$, say, $a = x \in S$, then either $ab = xx_1 \in A(x)$, or $b \ne x_1$ and ab is dominated by $x_1x_3 \in A(x)$.

Suppose then that $a \notin S$. Since S is a dominating set of G, a has at least one neighbour in S, say, x. Consider the case $b = x$ first. In this case, if $a \in \{x_2, x_3\}$ then $ab \in A(x)$; if $a = x_1$ then $ab = x_1x$ is dominated by x_3x; and if $a \notin \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ then one of x_1x_3 and x_2x dominates ab since $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is a dominating set of $G[N(x)]$. In the case where $b \neq x$, if $a \neq x_1$ then ab is dominated by xx_1, and if $a = x_1$ then either $ab = x_1x_3 \in A(S)$ or ab is dominated by x_3x.

So far we have proved that every arc of G outside $A(S)$ is dominated by $A(S)$. Therefore, $\gamma(X(G)) \leq |A(S)| \leq 4|S| = 4\gamma(G)$ and (11) is established.

To show that (11) is sharp, let G^* be obtained from two vertex-disjoint complete graphs K_s and K_t of orders $s, t \geq 2$ respectively by identifying a vertex of K_s with a vertex of K_t. Since $\gamma(X(H)) \geq 3$ for any graph H with $\delta(H) \geq 2$ [8, Theorem 7], we have $\gamma(X(G^*)) \geq 3$. However, no three arcs of G^* dominate all other arcs of G^*. Therefore, $\gamma(X(G^*)) = 4 = 4\gamma(G^*)$. □

Since line graphs are claw-free, the bound (11) holds in particular when G is the line graph of some graph of minimum degree at least two.

Acknowledgement Guangjun Xu was supported by the MIFRS and SFS scholarships of the University of Melbourne.

References

[1] H. J. Broersma and C. Hoede, Path graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **13** (1989), 427–444.

[2] C. Balbuena, P. García-Vázquez and L. P. Montejano, On the connectivity and restricted edge-connectivity of 3-arc graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 2013, doi:10.1016/j.dam.2007.06.014.

[3] C. Berge, *Graphs and Hypergraphs*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1973.

[4] J. F. Fink, M. S. Jacobson, L. F. Kinch and J. Roberts, On graphs having domination number half their order, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **16** (1985), 287–293.

[5] A. Gardiner, C. E. Praeger and S. Zhou, Cross-ratio graphs, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **64** (2001), 257–272.

[6] R. L. Hemminger and L. W. Beineke, Line graphs and line digraphs, in: *Selected Topics in Graph Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.

[7] M. A. Iranmanesh, C. E. Praeger and S. Zhou, Finite symmetric graphs with two-arc transitive quotients, *J. Combin. Theory (Ser. B)* **94** (2005), 79–99.

[8] M. Knor, G. Xu and S. Zhou, A study of 3-arc graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **159** (2011), 344–353.

[9] M. Knor and S. Zhou, Diameter and connectivity of 3-arc graphs, *Discrete Math.* **310** (2010), 37–42.

[10] C. H. Li, C. E. Praeger and S. Zhou, A class of finite symmetric graphs with 2-arc transitive quotients, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* **129** (2000), 19–34.

[11] H. E. Li and Y. X. Lin, On the characterization of path graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **17** (1993), 463–466.

[12] Z. Lu and S. Zhou, Finite symmetric graphs with 2-arc transitive quotients (II), *J. Graph Theory* **56** (2007), 167–193.

[13] W. McCuaig and B. Shepherd, Domination in graphs with minimum degree two, *J. Graph Theory* **13** (1989), 749–762.

[14] O. Ore, *Theory of Graphs*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1962.

[15] C. Payan, and N. H. Xuong, Domination-balanced graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **6** (1982), 23–32.

[16] B. Reed, Paths, stars and the number three, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **5** (1996), 277–295.

[17] C. Thomassen, Tilings of the torus and the Klein bottle and vertex-transitive graphs on a fixed surface, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **323** (1991), 605–635.

[18] D. B. West, *Introduction to Graph Theory*, 2nd ed., Prentice Hall, New York, 2001.

[19] D. R. Wood, G. Xu and S. Zhou, Hadwiger's conjecture for 3-arc graphs, *submitted*, 2013, `http://arxiv-web3.library.cornell.edu/abs/1310.4337`.

[20] G. Xu and S. Zhou, Hamiltonicity of 3-arc graphs, *Graphs Combin.*, 2013, doi:10.1007/s00373-013-1329-5.

[21] S. Zhou, Constructing a class of symmetric graphs, *European J. Combin.* **23** (2002), 741–760.

[22] S. Zhou, Almost covers of 2-arc transitive graphs, *Combinatorica* **24** (2004), 731-745. [Erratum: **27** (2007), 745–746.]